



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/546,227	04/10/2000	Kazuhiko Koike	PM268032	2762

7590 01/14/2003

Nixon & Vanderhye P.C.  
Larry S. Nixon  
1100 North Glebe Road  
8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201

EXAMINER

JOHNSON, EDWARD M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1754

22

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/546,227

Applicant(s)

KOIKE ET AL.

Examiner

Edward M. Johnson

Art Unit

1754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 73-78,80-99,102 and 103 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 74,75 and 87-93 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 73,76-78,80-86,94-99,102 and 103 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 21.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to because it is labeled "Fig. 1" although it is the only drawing in the application. Examiner suggests deletion. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The figure is referred to as "Fig. 1", which should be changed to --the figure--, since there is only one figure in the application.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 73, 76-77, and 80-83 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Guile et al. US 5,716,899.

Art Unit: 1754

Regarding claim 73, Guile '899 discloses catalyst comprising a pore-impregnated ceramic body (see abstract).

Regarding claim 80, Guile '899 discloses cordierite, Si, and Al (see column 3, lines 27-38 and 46).

Regarding claims 76-77, 81-83 Guile '899 discloses vanadium oxide and copper filling the pores (see column 7, lines 44-48) and ceria (see column 3, lines 27-38).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 73, 76-86, 97, and 102-103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichii in view of Beauseigneur et al. 5,346,722.

Regarding claims 77-86, Ichii '885 discloses cordierite honeycomb (see column 3, lines 43-47) with a lattice defect with oxygen vacancies and oxygen storing capability (see column 1, lines 63-66; the term "capability" indicating oxygen may or may not be stored), a composition of more than 48% by weight (see

Art Unit: 1754

column 5, lines 29-30), and a honeycomb catalyst carrier without a coating (see column 1, lines 17-19), heating to form microcracks, and reheating (see column 4, lines 60-67).

Ichii '885 fails to specifically disclose ceria, catalytic metals, and pore size of 100 nm or less.

Beauseigneur '722 discloses ceria (see abstract), transition metals (see column 6, line 29 and column 7, lines 65-68), and pore size of less than 5 microns (see column 3, lines 67-68).

It is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the pore diameter, ceria, and metals of Beauseigneur in the honeycomb cordierite of Sato because Beauseigneur discloses his ceria as particularly preferred (see column 6, lines 54-55), in a method of improving thermal shock resistance (title), in a honeycomb cordierite (see column 1, lines 5-24), to support catalyst metals for use as catalyst (see column 7, lines 65-68).

Regarding claims 76-93, Beauseigneur '722 discloses pore diameter less than 5 microns (see column 3, lines 67-68) and catalyst metals (see column 7, lines 65-68), including noble metals (see column 8, lines 65-66).

Regarding claim 77, it is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 1754

invention was made to use Pt as a catalyst metal in view of Applicant's admission that such catalysts are "widely used" and "conventional" (see specification, page 1, second full paragraph).

Regarding claim 78, it is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use pores of 0-50 microns because Ichii discloses microcracks on particles of 50 microns, which disappear (see abstract and column 8, lines 52-55).

Regarding claim 97, Ichii discloses mixing and pouring, both of which would cause vibration in a liquid.

Regarding claims 102-103, Ichii discloses  $2\text{MgO} \cdot 2\text{AlO}_3 \cdot 5\text{SiO}_2$  (see column 5, line 29).

7. Claims 94, 96, and 98-99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichii '885 as applied to claim 73 above, and further in view of Knapton et al. 4,189,405.

Regarding claim 94, Ichii fails to disclose CVD or PVD.

Knapton '405 discloses chemical vapour deposition (see column 5, lines 11-19).

It is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the CVD of Knapton in the catalyst of Ichii because Knapton

Art Unit: 1754

discloses the CVD in an intermetallic catalyst (title) to form an alumina layer on alloys which do not contain sufficient aluminum to form their own alumina layer (see column 5, lines 11-14) and to give the requisite compound (see column 2, lines 48-51).

Regarding claim 96, Knapton discloses water or an organic solvent, which would obviously, to one of ordinary skill, include organic solvents that have a higher surface tension than water.

Regarding claims 98-99, Knapton discloses impregnation by heating a mixture of chemicals to produce the catalyst (see column 2, lines 40-47).

8. Claim 95 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichii '885 as applied to claim 73 above, and further in view of Abe et al. 5,489,865.

Regarding claim 95, Ichii fails to disclose supercritical conditions.

Regarding claim 95, Abe '865 discloses drying gel under supercritical condition (see column 3, lines 48-50).

It is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the supercritical conditions of Abe in the catalyst process of Ichii because Abe discloses the supercritical conditions in a

Art Unit: 1754

catalyst process (title) to obtain a noble metal-dispersed alumina precursor sol or gel (see column 3, lines 47-48).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claims 87-93 are allowed.

10. Claims 74-75 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: an average distance between catalyst particles of 0.1-1000 or 0.1-100 nm in the catalyst ceramic body of the instant claims 74-75 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. It also would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to fire the honeycomb directly after heating to remove binder in the process of the instant claims 87-93.

***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments filed 12/4/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument's are considered moot in view of the new ground of rejection. It is noted that "replacing" appears to be a process step limitation rather than a product limitation



Art Unit: 1754

and the presence of all the elements of the claimed product within the prior art is considered to meet a product claim whether or not a replacing process step is disclosed.

**Conclusion**


13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward M. Johnson whose telephone number is 703-305-0216. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P. Griffin can be reached on 703-308-1164. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

EMJ

January 13, 2003



Edward M. Johnson  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1754